In considering the nature of the measures which are necessary to ensure effective financing of the world crisis (of which the present abnormal war situation is merely the preliminary episode) certain fairly obvious propositions will bear recall.

(a) If it is possible without exhausting our credit to spend £2,000,000,000 per annum on pure economic waste, and it is possible, because we are doing it, it is possible to spend a much larger sum on the production of economic wealth which would be the basis of greater credit. It follows from this that the reason that we have been taxed as no other people in the world have ever been taxed, for the last twenty years, and are now to be still more heavily taxed, is purely arbitrary. To put the matter another way, either the spending power (which normally governs producing power) of the general population has been deliberately reduced in peace time by unnecessary taxation, or it is intended that all expenditure not financed by taxation shall be recovered in future taxation, with the object of reducing still further the consumers’ purchasing power, and the consequent possibility of wealth production financed by consumer purchase in peace time. The policy is clear enough; it is to remove the margin of economic security provided by an “unearned” income and to force the individual to apply either for work or relief.

(b) “Spending” has just the same results if it takes place out of sums proceeding from “loans” as if from the proceeds of taxation, provided that money retains its definition.

(c) The taxpayer loses his money permanently, although he probably obtained it in return for his personal services. This is just as true of so-called “unearned” incomes in the hands of the general public, as of wages and salaries.

On the other hand the subscriber to a loan gets a permanent security for his money, which, over a period, is more valuable than the money he subscribes. In the case of the banks or issuing houses, which collectively provide probably 80 per cent. of the loans, the money subscribed is counterfeit money, not representing a token of services rendered, as well as a claim on alternative services, as is the case with money in the hands of the public, but simply a new claim to whatever it will buy. So that three kinds of money are used for Government finance; confiscated money, bought money, and counterfeit money. Of these, bought money alone is justifiable.

(d) If prices of consumable goods are allowed to rise, the public is again taxed by the amount of the rise; and every rise in prices is a departure of money from its definition.

(c) Broadly, securities represent capital values; cash or current deposits, consumable values.

(f) It is not necessary to make the general public permanently financially poorer in war time. If certain articles are required for war purposes they can either be withdrawn from the market, or rationed, but it is not necessary to make the public pay for them by taxation.

Post war slumps are directly due to price rises and taxation, which are only different forms of the same thing.

We hear a great deal on the subject of equality of sacrifice in war time. It may perhaps be desirable to consider the question of equality of benefits.

The first step towards such equality, is obviously to insure that all the money required for the service of the state shall be the same kind of money (cf.(c) supra). If it is correct that the financier shall obtain War Stock for nothing, it is equally correct that the citizen whose liability to the nation is collectively unlimited, should obtain War Stock for nothing. It would certainly appear to be beyond question that, instead of losing his hard earned money by taxation, he should be protected from the results of the issue, by German and other Jews, of money which, as in the case of the large credits provided by the Bank of England to “build up a strong Germany” as Mr. John Gunther puts it, may be used to deprive him of the very land he lives in.

I have already put forward, in skeleton form, certain suggestions to this effect. Pending the application of effective pressure to secure a change of policy, I do not think that any useful object would be served by further elaboration, beyond the observation that a system of compensated prices is an integral part of them.

The human mind is particularly given to “wishful
is that of Sir W. S. Gilbert.

“The Law is the embodiment of everything that’s excellent,
It has no kind of fault or flaw,
And I, my Lords, embody the Law.”

You see how it works. We arrange matters in Germany, firstly that only a Dictatorship can emerge from the chaos made inevitable by the financiers who moulded the Peace Treaty. Then we finance the Dictator with British money, at the instance of international agents, in the sure and certain promise that he will make war inevitable.

Then we have a war to put down Hitlerism (not of course, Stalinism) and we agree, even before the war has really started, that the only final cure for war is World Super-Hitlerism. We proceed, in fact, from the Police State to the Police World.

Well, you can fool some of the people, all of the time...

(To be continued).

(WORLD COPYRIGHT RESERVED)

NOT NAZI-ISM

Sir,

The Home Secretary’s remarks on “a certain body which is well-known to be anti-Semitic and is conducting propaganda in this country helpful to the Nazi cause” seemed to imply that anything anti-Semitic is inimical to the interests of the British people.

It also appeared to suggest that anything anti-Semitic was pro-Nazi. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Yours faithfully,

A. H. WAINWRIGHT.

65, Fairlands Road, Sale, Cheshire; November 2nd, 1939.

SELLING

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

Dear Sir,

Each week I give two copies of The Social Crediter to a newsagent—he has a regular reader for one, but usually I have the other back unsold. But since the war he has been selling the other copy quite often, to chance buyers. This is interesting, and I feel that other individuals should get newsagents to display a copy or two, as there is no doubt that there are a considerable number of people thinking about things to-day. In addition, the news trade have stopped taking returns from retailers. The result of this is that newsagents only order what they can definitely sell, and so have very little to put out on their counter. Consequently they are particularly willing to-day to display our paper if they can return it if unsold. It really is a fine opportunity for us and one of which we should make the most.

Yours faithfully,

ROBERT FOWLER.

117, Cathedral Road, Cardiff; October 30th, 1939.

FOR THE CENSOR

Dear Sir,

May I make a suggestion to your readers that whenever they write to correspondents overseas they put in something for the Censor. This week my message has been “Read ‘The Purpose of Politics’, price 3d., obtainable from” etc.

Yours faithfully,

E. M. E.

SOCIAL CREDITERS AND WAR

Dear Sir,

Seven years ago, I became familiar with the writings of Major C. H. Douglas, and very quickly began to visualise the wonderful world envisaged by social crediters.

This period of exhilaration, speedily gave rise to one of despair, the like of which I had not previously experienced, due entirely to comparison of the social credit vision, with the world of the day. Such despair became increasingly difficult to surmount.

To-day, I find in the midst of this Money Powered Chaos, called “WAR”, a sense of complete peace, and thought far removed from that of despair, due to my knowledge of social credit, and the possession of an ability to use it.

It is this peace, and thought, which is a constant aid in the preservation of a balance of mind, in a world where such balance is becoming an ever increasing difficulty.

Yours faithfully,

CHAS. E. DEAN.

Gateacre, Liverpool; October 29, 1939.

BELIEF AND UNBELIEF

The most singular and deepest themes in the History of the Universe and Mankind, to which all the rest are subordinate, are those in which there is a conflict between Belief and Unbelief, and all epochs, wherein Belief prevails, under what form it will, are splendid, heart-elevating and fruitful. All epochs, on the contrary, when Unbelief, in what form soever, maintains its sorry victory, should they even for a moment glitter with a sham splendour, vanish from the eyes of posterity, because no one chooses to burden himself with the study of the unfruitful.

—Goethe.
Uncle Sends Arms

America cashes in on the European War with the signing of the Neutrality Bill repealing the Arms Embargo and enabling belligerents to buy arms in the U.S.A. on a "cash and carry" basis. Somebody, at least, "thought so all along," for four days later we hear that the first consignment of aeroplane engines from America is on its way to England. The report adds modestly that it is "part of an order placed last June . . . which, when completed, would have been stored in New York, had the ban on such exports not been removed."

A picturesque detail is that President Roosevelt, in signing the bill used two pens, one of which he afterwards presented to Senator Key Pittman, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who in the spring embarrassed official circles in the United States by broadcasting the policy of the real rulers of America. He assured American isolationists that the United States would not have to fight, while expressing the opinion that the democratic countries of Europe should be prepared to do so.

The second pen was presented to Mr. Sol. Bloom, non-Aryan chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who piloted the Bill through Congress.

In the last war arms were sent to England from America:

"Millions upon millions of rounds of small arms ammunition sent from America were absolutely useless, as proved to be the case later with a large proportion of the shells. American ammunition for rifles and machine guns . . . in some fifty per cent. of the cases split in half on being fired, where the junction of the two pieces occurred, with disastrous results."

—Brigadier-General C. D. Baker-Carr in "From Chauffeur to Brigadier."

"If any one group obtained substantial predominance in Europe, we should be faced with the necessity of defending the Monroe doctrine on the American continent."

—Senator Key Pittman.

News and Views

Our Brains-Trust

Since the statement made by Captain Crookshank in the House of Commons on October 3rd that Parliament was to be asked to vote a grant to the Royal Institute of International Affairs, members have been curious to know what the amount of this grant was to be. Further information about this was given yesterday by Mr. R. A. Butler, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in a written reply to a question by Sir Herbert Williams.

Mr. Butler's reply was that the grant-in-aid previously referred to by Captain Crookshank "has not yet been fixed, but it will probably not exceed £35,000 for the present financial year."

The subject was raised in the House of Commons on October 3rd by Sir Alfred Knox, who asked what was the amount of public funds granted "to the organization now installed at Balliol College, Oxford." Captain Crookshank then replied that the Royal Institute of International Affairs had undertaken certain services for the Foreign Office and other Departments during the war. These services included a digest of the overseas Press and the preparation of material of various kinds. This work and the removal to Oxford, he said, would entail extra expense which the Institute could not meet, and for that reason it was proposed to ask Parliament to vote a grant.

—The Times, November 8, 1939.

Director of Studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs is Professor Arnold Toynbee:

". . . I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working discreetly, but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands, because to impugn the sovereignty of the local national states of the world is still a heresy for which a statesman or publicist can be—perhaps not quite burnt at the stake, but certainly ostracised and discredited."

—Speech at Copenhagen in 1931.

Mr. Churchill

A recent radio programme from Germany declared that Winston Churchill is the bosom friend of the Jewish American financier Baruch who "organised the attack on the £ sterling and thus forced Chamberlain to yield" [to starting the war].

—Evening Standard.

Put up the Circulation
Get Rich Doing So

It is essential for the national interest that the circulation of The Social Crediter should be increased without delay. It is doubtful whether any social crediter will quarrel with this statement. The winning of the war at an early date; that it should be a victory in the interests of the British People, instead of a clique of Internationalists; that the peace which is won should be enduring and satisfying to the individual: these are things which depend at least upon a wider recognition of that truth which is to be found in the pages of The Social Crediter.

Articles of special public interest are to be published in the paper week by week from December 2nd onwards. Apart from the inherent interest of these articles, they will provide a background of knowledge which will make other articles in the paper more readily appreciated and assimilated.

In order that effective use may be made of this development by readers in securing new readers a number of special aids have been prepared to facilitate this work; and they DO make the work very easy.

In addition to this a special "one month's trial" subscription form is available, whereby for 2/6 the prospective reader may sample the paper for a month. A bonus of 1/3 will be paid for each "Trial Reader." This commission should be retained by the collector unless it is desired to donate it to the Secretariat, only 1/3 being sent to the office. It will not be paid any other way. On no account should this 1/3 be returned to the subscriber.

November 15th to December 15th has been declared as Circulation Drive Month. A great effort is being made by the Secretariat to make this a success. We appeal to all readers to USE THE OPPORTUNITY. Send for aids and subscription forms (free of charge) now.

J. M.
THE SOCIAL CREDITER
November 11th, 1939.

Mrs. PALMER’S PAGE

THE CHOICE

“Every interest of the individual is now at stake. He must be very careful not to confuse policy and administration.” - C. H. DOUGLAS.

The inner councils of World Jewry, as Douglas says, are working steadily towards their policy of world domination through finance. They are silent, as far as the public are concerned, for their policy does not require intelligent co-operation for its fulfilment.

They can work best in an atmosphere of stupidity and confusion, and this is supplied generously by the pronouncements of our party politicians. One of the social crediters’ tasks is to clarify his own ideas to the point where he can “deunk” these statements as they appear in the daily press, or broadcast over the air.

Since September the ordinary citizen has realised that there is nothing to choose between Fascism and Communism as demonstrated by their figureheads “Hitler” and “Stalin.” He also understands that the Anglo-Saxons are fighting for “democracy”, something very different from “totalitarianism.”
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LANCASHIRE

The Federation of Master Cotton Spinners' Associations; (chairman, W. M. Wiggins) in conjunction with the Parliamentary Monetary Committee (chairman W. Craven Ellis, M.P) have issued a "Report on War Time Finance."

This report is notable for its digressions from monetary orthodoxy, and bears the distinct impress of certain factual knowledge which has been vigorously propagated by social crediters for years past.

The Report shows an awareness to the dangers inherent in the present restrictive monetary policy of the Government, which is belated, but probably gives expression to a widespread if vague apprehension existing amongst the business community.

Below will be found extracts, the realism of which by no means typifies much that is written elsewhere in the Report; but the extracts are nevertheless evidence of a knowledge which might someday lead to more comprehensive conclusions than are presented.

J. M.

From the REPORT:

"There cannot be any question whether we would be able to finance any effort of which, as a community, we are capable. It is physical exhaustion, and not any question of finance, which sets the limits to our powers."

"No questions of financial orthodoxy can be allowed to interfere with the prosecution of the struggle. The limits of the nation's power are the limits to its capacity to produce and use the implements of war, and no such artificial factor as financial stringency can be allowed to interfere with the exercise of its full strength."

"It is less evident, but no less true, that the financial costs of armaments or war, also, must be met at the time that the cost is incurred. Much is written and spoken about leaving the payment to posterity. But all who provide services or material for the nation's use require payment here and now, so that it is impossible for an unbegotten posterity to meet the bill."

BORROWING

"In considering the advisability of borrowing, we have to distinguish between borrowing within the limits of actual savings—that is, the excess of the community's aggregate income over the spending of individuals either on consumption or capital goods—and the borrowing of funds in excess of actual savings; funds which from time to time may be brought into existence by the creation of bank credit and which are additional to actual savings. As the process of borrowing funds of the latter kind would be inflationary in its effects, it will be considered in the section under 'Inflation'."

INFLATION.

"Inflation would make its appearance if the rise of prices continued beyond the point where present deflationary influences ceased to operate. It may be that under the stress of expanding Government expenditure we shall witness such inflation in the near future. This will largely depend upon the methods by which Government needs are financed. If expanding Government requirements are financed by means of the unregulated increase of either currency or bank credit, a considerable degree of inflation will be inevitable. . . . Between July, 1914, and June, 1920, the amount of currency in circulation and in the cash reserves of the banks increased by £370,000,000. This increase of currency represented money which had been turned out by the printing press, practically without costs, and it came into circulation by way of Government spending. The late Sir Walter Leaf said of this issue of Treasury Notes: 'The amount and manner of the issue was left to the absolute discretion of the Treasury. This was essentially a War Loan free of interest, for an unlimited period, and as such was a highly profitable expedient from the point of view of the Government.' The all-important feature of that war-time issue of Treasury Notes was that it provided the Government with funds over and above the proceeds of taxation by a process which did not add to the national debt."

"The above quotations [quotations familiar to readers of this paper from the Report of the Cunliffe Committee] show conclusively that the increase of bank deposits, which was in effect a creation of money by the action of the banks, was an important factor in the rise of prices which ensued. And when we remember that such privately-created money was invested in Government Bills and Loans which were subject to rates of interest varying from 3½ to over 6 per cent, it becomes clear how the financial cost of the last war was unnecessarily inflated."

"To prevent the repetition of that experience, measures should be devised to ensure that, in the financing of future Government requirements, any expansion of either currency or bank credit which is necessary, should be made on behalf of the nation as a whole and not on behalf of any private interest, as in the past. Such funds as accrued directly from the expansion of bank credit would then be available for Government use without carrying any interest charges."

EXPANSION OF BANK CREDIT

"The inevitable and constant increase of expenditure from the war will bring us, in time, to the position where an increase in the total volume of bank credit becomes necessary to provide sufficient funds on the market to keep the rates of interest at the desired levels. We would then see a repetition of the process of expansion of bank credit, such as we have noticed in connection with the financing of the last war. This raises the question whether it is equitable or economically expedient that the very considerable profits derived from such credit expansion should accrue to the banks, as the creators of this additional money."

"As the issue of money, whether in the form of currency or bank credit, represents the issue of claims against the goods and services of all members of the community, the power of issue should reside exclusively with the Government as the representative of the community at large. This is already the case with regard to the issue of money in the form of currency which does not differ in its essential nature as purchasing power from bank cheque-money. We saw how, during the last war, the increase of bank credits which were loaned to the Government involved a double payment by the community for the use of such money—one in the form of rising prices and once in the interest payable by the Government for its use. Equity demands, therefore, that as long as private interests are permitted to issue such money, any profits which accrue from it should go to the benefit of the State."
Moving Mountains

Anyone who sets out to declare the truth about anything in this world actually engages in no less a job than the above. For the truth about a thing is always belied by appearances; and in spite of many well-tried sayings to the effect that "things are not always what they seem," most of us go entirely by appearances.

So cleverly has the picture that is presented to the world to-day been dressed up, that men can see no way out other than that one which those who have faked the picture intend them to take. They are docile because they are daunted by appearances.

It is our job—the social crediter's job—to make known the truth underlying the false financial picture of things. We know; because a little, perhaps only an infinitesimal fraction, of the truth has been shown to us. How are we to go about this job—a mere handful of men? Our job is that of Truth. In its effective power? In its creation of credit, it doesn't necessarily follow that they have got rid of all illusions.

We have the truth then, upon this vital question of credit. It is our only card, against those who hold all the other. How are we to use it—to "make our light so shine . . . " that anything is achieved? What makes true knowledge effective?

There is only one answer: faith. No matter how unsatisfactory that answer may sound to many, there is no other.

Do we really believe in the efficacy of Truth? In its effective power? In it, as the only power, in the same scientific sense as we believe that there is only way of arriving at the sum of two figures in mathematics? That is the condition of mind we want to achieve.

Absolute Truth and absolute Reality are hidden from us. No man knows the Truth. No man has actually seen Reality. And in that fact lies the supreme need for faith, for religion, in the proper sense; the need to bind ourselves back to Reality—towards Reality; because, since it is unknown, Reality must remain for us no more than a direction.

The Planner is he who has no faith. As Douglas has shown, the planning, doubting, material intelligence, demands a specification and blue-print, complete in every detail, a map of the road he is to travel. Whereas the main fact about life is that we have to go forward without a chart, or submit to not going forward at all, or to going back.

The alternative is faith—the substance of things hoped for. Without it there can be no forward movement, only retrogression.

Faith is propulsion, motive-power, steam. Lacking it, a man cannot persist in the face of appearances, which are invariably set against forward movement. Faith is knowledge that contradicts appearances, and finally penetrates them.

These are not easy matters to make clear, but there is an analogy that may help. In southern Norway there is a lake called Suldsals. As you steam up it you are confronted by a cliff of rock. It is the end of everything—sheer, three or four hundred feet, unscaleable, impenetrable.

But the captain of the steamer has faith—knowledge which transcends the apparent. He steers straight for the wall of rock, and, literally, when the little boat seems to be about to flatten her nose against its base, a passage appears, as though a huge lock-gate had opened.

The advocates of Truth are always confronted by an equivalent "appearance"—an impenetrable wall of prejudice and mis-information and conscious hostility. And only faith, as defined above, can give one the propulsive power and necessary steerage-way to go straight for it. It isn't speed and dash that is wanted. The future can't be taken by assault. It is just persistence. The little lake steamer did twelve knots at most—but she got through, because those who directed her knew, and faith and knowledge are one.

There are times undoubtedly when the job in front of us seems impossible. But remember this, if we are right, if we have facts on our side, that impossibility must be of exactly the same nature as the financial negative which confronts civilization to-day—no more, and no less real. It is only an appearance, a projection. The negative is in our minds, not in fact.

N. F. WEBB.
What mischief is The Times up to?

We have been told the war is to last three years, and at the close of the second month The Times is spending its space to propagandise on the theme that it is time to sink England in a United States of Europe. Perhaps the great bulwark against the abuse of governmental power is having its fling against Sir John Anderson? Or against my Lords Runciman, Zeitland and Newton who, with Captain Crookshank, constituted “His Majesty’s” Privy Council on September 1st and passed an Order not seen by Members of Parliament or the public until after war had been declared, which destroyed the effectiveness of the Rule of Law, “the constitutional basis of British freedom.”

It could not be that only The Times and propagandist organisations animated by the “ideals” of Israel Moses Sieff, enjoy immunity from the new and secret punishments designed for those who offend the Bureaucrats! These punishments cannot have been invented merely to secure a relative and respectful hush in which authorised disputants hear each other’s “free and responsible” voices, but no one else’s!

A nation-wide campaign has been launched by agents who are “planners” (or should it be “plotters”?) to a man: “leftist” internationalists every one of them. Have they captured The Times?

A privileged correspondent of the newspaper on November 3rd wrote an article which “looks for the creation of a federal solution as an escape from the necessity of fighting a major European war every twenty-five years.”

This is not an alternative. It is a diabolical threat. It neglects the essential difference between saying “If you put your finger in the fire you will be burnt” and “If you don’t put your finger in the fire you will be flogged.”

It means:

“If you, England, will not submerge your identity and merge your affairs and sink your funds in a superior government; If you, England, will not disband your forces and submit to external control over your powers of resistance to force; If you, England, pursue an economic policy not harmful for Englishmen but harmful to “the international community” —or International Banking Fraternity?—;

If you, England, do not come up for judgment when called upon; If you, England, do not sink, jewel that you are, into the Silver Sea;

It will be “necessary” for you to submit to a major European war once in every twenty-five years.

That threat certainly is not a matter for some secret sentence by some sly and secret committee. It ought to be a matter for the most public of public prosecutors, the people of England, to bring to trial and to judgment—their own judgment.

That the proposals sponsored by The Times are not distorted by the foregoing presentation of them may be settled by consideration of the following from that newspaper:

“It may well be that eventually the solution of European or even of world problems is some form of federation, but at the present stage it seems impracticable to attempt more than to create favourable conditions for federalism to develop. Such conditions may include:

“A European Council with a common fund contributed by its member states; Internationally supervised limitation of armaments;
The provision of means whereby the international community can protect itself against harmful economic policies on the part of its members;

Compulsory third-party judgment;

Facilities for peaceful political change;

Further development of international agencies in industry, agriculture, finance, and communications; and

Propaganda for international purposes to combat excessive nationalism and to promote common aims.”

So far from exaggerating the proposals which “propaganda for international purposes” is already pressing upon public attention, therefore, our paraphrase omits to emphasise their embryonic character and to expose the nature of present “international agencies” of which further development is contemplated.

In consideration of the fact that these same “international agencies” have already prevented the natural development of every country in the world, wasted its substance, dissipated its resources, and made its economic life subordinate to the necessities of the

international agents” who mask the “international agencies,” of which not the least is the precipitation of a major European war every 25 years, is there any reasonable ground for viewing an enlargement of their plans with anything but the profoundest misgiving?

In concrete terms, they “offer” £100 millions a year to raise the standard of life in Europe and its colonies overseas. Since the population envisaged cannot be far short of half the world’s population, or 1,000 millions, the “offer” comes to 2/- per annum per head, and if the people can be got to view it in that light —it’s “off”! The amendment of “Rule Britannia” to confirm to servitude of Britons in exchange for a rental of two bob a year (subject to depreciation, discount and manipulation) may be left to the inspired.

Has it been noticed how extreme a preciosity is shown by our “planners” (or “plotters”, as the case may be)? Here is one fenced in with apologies by the leader-writer and the sub-editor in reinforcement of his own, that what is forecast is only a modest start, confronted with “formidable” difficulties. Yet all is so ready when the details are examined. Is this another offspring of the state-departments working to the order of P.E.P.?

“We have in being to-day,” persuades the anonymous correspondent, “in the Supreme Council and the inter-Allied High Command, a standing organ of government with a powerful influence over two distinct sovereign States, and a combination of armed forces under unified control.” [But do the French and English people know their countries are subject to this “powerful influence” —backed by “armed forces”?] “If by common consent these arrangements could be kept functioning after the war it would only be necessary to add to the Supreme Council representatives of other States, and to add to the armed forces contingents from ex-neutral and ex-enemy countries in order to have an international organ of government with an international police force at its disposal.”

So perhaps the diabolical thing has really been done, and The Times is merely telling us now so that the remaining 34 months of war may suffice for the so-much-more it has left over to tell us of our fate.

If it has not been done, it has at
least been planned; and where it has been planned is accessible to conjecture if the following sentences be compared:

(a) "... it is not only inevitable but desirable that citizens less burdened with responsibility [than members of responsible governments] should explore the subject." (The Times correspondent).

(b) "What Lord Lothian asked from our American friends was not to fight, but to think with us, and to some extent for us." (The Times leader-writer).

How inspired of Lord Lothian to ask "our American friends" to do our thinking for us: it is not the last thing that would have occurred to them in Wall Street, for they have been doing it, with disastrous consequences for us and for the world, certainly since 1914 and probably since the voyage of the Mayflower. "We have not very much time for thinking," said Lord Lothian.

In a world whose chief if not its only technical difficulty is to obtain its own permission to make and to use its own things, it is self-evident that the powers to make and to use things inherent in the temporary possession of 2/- per head per annum is neither here nor there. The world has yet time to think this. The suggestion that £100 millions represents a reasonable quid pro quo for the sacrifice of the national liberties of the nation's of Europe is—Jewish. Advocacy of such proposals by The Times is a betrayal of the nation.

T. J.

THIS PLAN TO CONTROL BRITAIN

By JOHN MITCHELL

Bureaucracy and Earl Baldwin

This article shows that the present bureaucratic fever is only the logical outcome of a policy consistently pursued since the war of 1914–18.

Who is responsible to the people of England for this policy?

The Rating and Valuation Act of 1925 was the first enabling act allowing extraordinary powers to the Minister to make rules and regulations to "remove difficulties."

In 1926 the Empire Marketing Board was started; Agricultural Marketing Acts of 1931 and 1933 are the basic legislation that enabled, in 1933, the hops, pigs, bacon, milk and potato boards to start their flood of regulations, control, petty officials and paper forms. In 1914 the total amount of money spent on civil services was £93 millions; in 1924 it was £213 millions, and in 1938 £500 millions.

The Electricity (Supply) Act, 1926, provided for the setting up of the Central Electricity Board for Great Britain. The Board was set up in 1927.

Bureaucracy, in fact, dates from the last war.

IT ANTEDATES Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (1937—); and its inception coincides with Earl Baldwin's control of policy—(1923-24, 1924-29, 1935-37); but its Fabian origin and the support it gains from all parties betrays the existence of a power above parties and governments.

Critics of the warplanning which is being carried out in Great Britain are many and varied, but few among them appreciate that it is but the continuation of a consistent policy which has been persistently pursued since the last Great War. The aim of it is to centralise and concentrate power into the hands of a few individuals, who are already in control of the banks, insurance companies and other large financial institutions.

By a system of interowning stocks, interlocking directorates, assignment of spheres of interests and by a mutual arrangement of interests, the banking system is one whole, presenting different fronts in different corporate names.

When the World War ended on November 11th, 1918, Great Britain was relatively prosperous: her people were fully employed, industry was flourishing, and wages were good. These conditions continued throughout 1919 and most of 1920. A great industrial crisis then supervened, with unemployment on an unprecedented scale; wages fell, profits vanished, and company reconstructions, bankruptcies and suicides rose alarmingly in number. This vast change followed on the re-election of Mr. Montague Norman to the Governorship of the Bank of England and the inauguration by him of a policy of currency and credit contraction.

When Mr. Montague Norman began these proceedings in 1920 no more than 2.4 per cent. of Britain's workers were unemployed, as compared with 3.3 per cent. in 1914. By May, 1921, after the deflationary money policy had taken effect, no less than 23 per cent. of the workers were unemployed. In three years from December, 1920, to December, 1923, wages fell by 40 per cent.

One result of this policy on the industrial side was that holdings of war loan which had been taken up by the industrialists passed from them to the banks in return for accommodation during the long depression, and the British National Debt to-day is almost entirely held by the banks and other financial institutions.

With their holdings of War Bonds and other reserves absorbed, industrial concerns throughout the country were plunged into difficulties as the depression progressed. These difficulties, according to the evidence presented to the Macmillan Committee (appointed by the Government) by various industrial organisations, were much increased in the case of small concerns by the change that had come over British banking. During and immediately after the war enormous bank amalgamations were effected, and five colossal banking combines with centralized administration came to control the economic life of the country.

The great difficulty in the way of obtaining capital for small concerns was dwelt upon at length by Mr. E. L. Payton in giving evidence to the Macmillan Committee, on behalf of the National Union of Manufacturers on February 27th, 1930.

Further evidence as to the starving of small individual
traders was given by Sir William Perring, President of the National Chamber of Trade, an organization representing some 360 local Chambers of Trade. He said:

"The development during the last 20 years of large manufacturing units, as against the old system of a large number of small units, has, in our judgement, not fulfilled the expectations which were held as to the general advantage that would ensue from the anticipated reduction of productive costs . . ."

The banks, continued the witness, did not treat the small man with the same consideration as in bygone years. The history of industry in Britain had been one of growth from small beginnings, but it had become much more difficult in consequence of the change in banking policy for a man with brains and organising ability to start as a master man.

On members of the committee questioning this view, the witness said:

"In each provincial town which you go in to-day, if you walk up the main street you will see five businesses out of six are multiple shops or chain shops. That is the position in the main street. They have been secured at fabulous rents and premiums. The banks handle the money of these multiple shops. The small man is being squeezed out, and I think ultimately it will be to the detriment of our people as a nation."

In giving evidence before this Committee, Sir Guy Granet, a director of the Bank of England, emphasised that tact was obviously needed in operating the bankers' policy:

"It would be a dreadful thing," said Sir Guy, "if industry thought that here was a body of bankers who were going to tell industry how they ought to be organised: that would at once set their bristles up."

Sir W. H. N. Goschen, chairman of the National Provincial Bank, had stated:

"They are very much in the hands of the banks in this respect, that the banks are able to put them in liquidation if necessary."

Lord Macmillan asked:

"The power behind your advice is 'If you do not take that course we shall cut off your supplies'?"

Sir W. H. N. Goschen replied: "Yes."

The next big instalment of the process of rivetting this iniquitous tyranny upon the British people occurred in 1930-31. The slump of this period was engineered by the same policy of credit contraction. This time it was initiated by the American end of the International Financiers' Ring.

Referring to this slump in the U.S.A. Congress on December 15, 1931, Mr. Louis T. McFadden, ex-President of the Pennsylvania Bankers' Association and for twelve years Chairman of the U.S.A. House of Representatives' Banking and Currency Committee said:

"It was not accidental. It was a carefully contrived occurrence—The International Bankers sought to bring about a condition of despair here so that they could emerge as the rulers of us all."

It is a very necessary condition for the progressive development of the operations of the Soviet Planners in Great Britain that catastrophe, slump and crisis should occur. These conditions provide the ground which enable them to rivet their soviet planned organisation upon the various sections of the people.

In 1931 the organisation known as P.E.P. was formed. This organisation has never come near to obtaining that measure of attention from the general public to which its enormous influence entitles it, and in this connection it is interesting to record that on the first issues of its private journal, Planning, was printed a notice which included the following statement:

"You may use without acknowledgement anything which appears in this broadsheet, on the understanding that the broadsheet and the group are not publicly mentioned, either in writing or otherwise."

The first chairman of P.E.P. was Sir Basil Blackett, a director of the Bank of England, who was succeeded by the present holder of that office, Mr. Israel Moses Sieff. Since its formation individual traders, farmers and small businesses have lost initiative and independence, and in their place has been substituted standardisation, monopolies, trusts and marketing boards, all under the rule of what Mr. Sieff calls PLANNING AUTHORITY.

Possibly the most notable feature of government in recent years has been the remarkable growth of planning. It is to be found, among other places, in the Pigs Marketing Board, The Electricity Grid, B.B.C., Import Duties Advisory Committee, London Passenger Transport Board and Retail Trading Standards Association.

That conditions of peace were not favourable for the completion of THE PLAN was evidenced in a statement in P.E.P.'s journal for October 4th, 1938. This said: "We have started from the position that only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large scale planning."

Those persons who cling to the view that the present tragic state of the world is merely the result of an obstinate and blind adherence to certain outworn economic doctrines by bankers and politicians, and not a necessary stage for the furtherance of A PLAN administered by an all powerful clique of internationalists, would do well to ponder over the consistency of that policy of centralisation which is progressively dominating the lives of all men, where everything else appears chaotic and inconsistent.

JOHN MITCHELL.
THE POLICY OF THE JEWISH RACE

There is no problem the solution of which is more vital to civilisation than the "Jewish Problem." The Jewish race is unique: its members seem to have behaved with consistency throughout thousands of years.

The nature of the results produced by this behaviour forms the policy of the race, which is the expression in practice of its philosophy; and the effect of that policy on other peoples is what has built up the "Jewish Question."

This is one of a series of articles giving an account of the relations of Jewry with some other cultures. It is taken largely from Jewish sources, and therefore presents the policy of the Jewish race according to its own records. It is NOT an assessment of the success or otherwise of the policy disclosed.

11B. THE HOUSES OF ROTHSCHILD, MONTEFIORE, JOSEPH, SOLOMON and SASSOON [The British Empire]. UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA.

Jewish Year Book, 1939:

"Jews have been connected with the Cape of Good Hope from the earliest days of South African History. Jewish pilots accompanied the Portuguese navigators. Jews were included amongst the Dutch East India Company's officials [and several Jews were directors on its board] at the Cape and have held official positions in the British administration since 1806."

Jewish Encyclopaedia:

"Benjamin Norden, Simeon Markus together with a score of others arriving in the early thirties were commercial pioneers, to whom is due the commercial awakening of almost the whole interior of the Cape Colony . . . Julius Adolph and James Mosenthal . . . became the originators of the mohair industry . . . Aaron and Daniel De Pass were the first to open up Namaqualand and for many years were the largest shipowners in Cape Town, and leaders of the sealing, whaling and fishing industries. Jews were the first to take to ostrich farming* [Joel Myers] and the first rough diamond discovered on the Kimberley Diamond Fields was bought by Lilienfeld of Hopetown. Jews are among the directors of the De Beers Consolidated Diamond mines, which controls a great part of the world's diamond output to-day.

Government:

"Saul Salomon, the leader of the Liberal party had been called the 'Cape Disraeli.' He several times declined the premiership. Like Disraeli he early left Judaism, but always remained a lover of his people. The Gideons, the Moss, and the Isaacs families were all related to the Salomons . . . Simeon Jacobs, who was a judge in the Supreme Court of the Cape of Good Hope as the acting attorney-general of Cape Colony introduced and carried in 1882 the Cape Colony Responsible Government Bill, and Voluntary Bill (abolishing state-aid to the Anglican Church) for both of which bills Saul Salomon had fought for decades.

"At Kimberley there was established a synagogue [1901] to which Cecil Rhodes was a large donor."

ORANGE FREE STATE.

"For forty years after the establishment of the Orange Free State in 1855 one or two German Jewish families, many of them from Hesse-Cassel [see The House of Rothschild] were to be found in nearly every hamlet, together controlling the larger portion of the trade of the Free State . . . a beautiful synagogue was consecrated [at Bloemfontein, the capital] in March, 1904 in the presence of the Lieutenant-governor, the executive council and the justices of the colony.

Despite their small number Jews have from the first occupied an enviable position in the Orange Free State. Isaac Baumann was twice mayor of Bloemfontein and also director of the National Bank. M. Levisser has been connected with the State Museum, the Volks-hospital and nearly all other state-institutions since their respective foundations, and W. Ehrlich, the president of the congregation is also deputy-mayor of Bloemfontein, chairman of the Chamber of Commerce and member of the Inter-Colonial Conference."

NATAL.

"Seventeen years before the formal annexation of Natal by the British, and ten years before it was reached by the Boers, Nathaniel Isaacs was its 'principal chief."

Tchaka, called the Attila of South Africa, issued the following proclamation:

"I Tchaka, King and Protector of the Zooloos, do hereby create my friend Mr. Nathaniel Isaacs 'Induna Incola' or principal chief of Natal and do grant and make over to him . . . a free and full possession of my territory from the Umllass river westwards of Natal, etc., . . . free and exclusive right to traffic with my nation . . . so does the powerful King Tchaka recompense Mr. Nathaniel Isaacs for the services rendered to him to subdue 'Batia en Goma', and for the great attention to my people in the mission sent with him and Captain King to conclude an alliance with His Britannic Majesty."

Isaacs left Natal in 1831 when Tchaka's successor had prepared the massacre of the few white people living there. Later Jewish events in Natal merely repeat on a smaller scale those in the Cape Colony.

TRANSVAAL.

Jewish Encyclopaedia:

"Of the big Mining Houses which since the discovery of gold control the output in the Transvaal, the Barnatos, Neymann, Albu and several members of the firm of Eckstein are Jews.

"In 1884, Samuel Marks [born in Neystadt-Sugind, Russia] went to the Transvaal and through his coal, copper, gold and diamond mines, model farms and glass, brick, jam and spirit factories accumulated great wealth.

"A dramatic interest attaches to the struggle continued for a decade for the removal of the special Jewish disabilities. President Kriger and the executive were
frequently petitioned in every possible manner... the
president urged the substitution of the words 'Those who
believe in the revelation of God through his word in the
Bible' for the word 'Protestant' which change would
largely have modified the illiberal provisions, but the
Volksraad [parliament] both in secret and open session
rejected the proposals."

And upon these events there followed the declaration of
war between the British and the Dutch, a war that, in
Hillaire Belloc's words, 'was openly and undeniably pro-
voked by Jewish interests in South Africa' and which 'was
so unexpectedly prolonged and proved so unexpectedly
costly in blood and treasure.'

When, however, after three long years the war did come
to an end the above-mentioned Samuel Marks [coal, copper,
gold and diamond mines, etc.] put in an 'unexpected'
appearance at the peace conference:

"An intimate friend of Krüger, and enjoying the
confidence of General Botha, De Wett, and Delarey, and
the respect of Earl Roberts, Lord Kitchener and Lord
Milne he played no inconsiderable part in the negotiations
for the cessation of Anglo-Boer hostilities at Vereeniging,
May 29, 1902."

In 1914, South Africa, having obtained a Unitary
constitution in 1909 and, having in common with Australia
and New Zealand, introduced compulsory military training,
was ready to answer the call. In command of the South
African troops was General Smuts, who, at the "cessation of
hostilities" attended the Peace Conference of Versailles, on
York.
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